

AGENDA - RD&E BOARD - 1st MEETING

1. DDS&T Introduction
2. General Orientation on Agency Program
 - a. Handout (beforehand) of brief (2 page) paper on framework of Agency RD&E program covering:
 - (1) Significance of RD&E program to continued Agency competence.
 - (2) The nature of R&D in terms of Colby memo (short term, long term, mission oriented, multipurpose), high risk programs.
 - (3) Offices involved formally and informally
 - (4) Paragraph on previous schisms, communications problems between offices and directorates.
 - (5) The program categories - an attachment
 - b. Issues. Handout (beforehand) on examples of issues facing the Board over the years.
 - c. Need Board understanding of definition of "project" and post review. Project equates with the sub element level in the program structure..
3. Resources. Brief presentation by Briggs or Steininger on budget/manpower. See visual aids. Talking points will be provided.
4. Board decision on members of Standing Technical Committee. (Urge that this be kept to 1 member and alternate from each RD&E office, plus one member from PPB. If politics call for planning officers, they should be observers. OSP must be included, and we should consider whether FID, ☐ and OS/Tech should be involved to some extent. Formal procedures for chairing, calling meetings, determining agenda, preparing minutes should be work out and observed).
5. Board discussion, if not decision, on how to respond to Ex-Dir request for a report by 1 May.

D

R

A

F

T

21 March 1972

R&D Issues

Following are some examples of the issues facing the R&D Board and its working groups (in no necessary order of priority).

1. We have spent at least [] of non-NRO Government funds in the period FY 1966-1971 for [] 25X1

[] Millions more are programmed for FY 1972-1974. There have been no successful operations. Why is this? What needs to be done to put our advanced technology together to ~~see~~ *realize* intelligence producing operations?

2. What is the Agency posture vis a vis R&D contractors? Do we bring total Agency influence (including big NRO funded contracts) to bear on contractors? Do we have over-compartmentation when two or more offices are contracting with some firm, leading to inefficiencies and waste? What are our defects in presenting a solid Agency front with contractors, and how do we correct them?

3. Related to the above, the Contract Information System, a management tool of considerable promise for all Directorates and CIA as a whole, suffers serious deficiencies, both in data gaps and in archaic, inflexible computer programs. What should this system do for us, and what needs to be done to implement change?

4. How do the R&D offices deal with the Program Call requirements for statements of priority and evaluation?

5. Are the program categories meaningful to Agency management, the individual offices, OMB? If not, how should we change, and what are the ramifications?

6. Are our longer range programs related to changing intelligence requirements in the 1970's? In light of new priorities and constant or declining resources, what types of efforts should be curtailed or dropped?

7. What is our posture in handling projects wholly or partly funded by other agencies ? In addition to *the* 25X1 project review questions raised by Jack Blake, the Agency's reputation for competence is at stake in undertaking any project funded by another agency. What are, and what should be management review procedures in this area?

8. Compartmentation (perhaps excessive) and the physical dispersion of our R&D components seriously inhibits the free flow of technical information, including data on contractor relationships mentioned above, within the Agency. What can be done to ammeliorate this situation?

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/12/25 : CIA-RDP74B00535R000100020002-0

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2005/12/25 : CIA-RDP74B00535R000100020002-0